

REMARKS

The Applicant has filed the present Response in reply to the outstanding Official Action of December 5, 2003, and the Applicant believes the Response to be fully responsive to the Official Action for reasons set forth below in greater detail.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-23. Claims 1-3, 7, 9-14, 18, 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bork (U.S. Patent 6,255,800) (hereinafter "Bork"). With regard to Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Bork discloses a method of connecting a mobile communication unit to a computer comprising the steps of: (a) establishing a plurality of connections between a mobile unit having a rechargeable battery and a computer through a plurality of connector ports, (b) supplying power from a power source of the computer to the rechargeable battery, and (c) controlling the mobile unit through one of said connections according to a command signal supplied to said computer, where the computer recognizes the mobile communication unit as being a connected device which allows the computer to provide data synchronization and power.

Insofar as rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102(e) are concerned, it is axiomatic that anticipation pursuant to §102 requires that the prior art reference disclose each and every element of the claim in which it is applied. In re King, 801 F.2d 1324, 1326 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Thus, there must be no differences between the subject matter of the claim and the disclosure of the applied prior art reference. Stated another way, the prior art reference must contain within its four corners adequate direction to practice the invention as claimed. A corollary to the aforementioned rule, which is equally applicable, states that the absence from the applied prior art reference of any claimed element negates anticipation. Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible Inc., 793 F.2d 1565, 1571 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Applicant submits that Bork does not anticipate

amended Claims 1 and 9 because the reference does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended Claims 1 and 9.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a method of connecting a mobile device to a computer using a USB port to operate the mobile unit by entering commands into the computer. The method includes connecting a mobile device that is powered by using the USB port of the computer and having data transmitted via the same USB port. The mobile unit includes a controller for providing interactive communication with the phone controller by exchanging serial commands and serial response signals. The connector attaches the mobile unit to the computer and comprises *a phone attachment sensor to supply a phone attachment signal through one of the plurality of connector ports to an interface card in order to activate the controller.* When the mobile unit is removed from the connector, a phone detachment signal is sent to the computer.

Bork does not teach the step of sending a *phone attachment signal* through one of the plurality of connector ports.

Amended Claim 1 also recites a step for enabling a controller so that said controller is ready for accepting a command signal from an inputting means in response to said phase attachment signal. The enabling element selectively establishes a connection between the internal circuitry of the computer and the internal circuitry of the mobile unit. Bork does not teach or suggest this step either. Accordingly, Bork does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended Claim 1 and therefore cannot anticipate the claim.

Amended Claim 9 recites a system for connecting a mobile communication unit to a computer, comprising, inter alia, a phone attachment sensor detecting the presence of the mobile communication unit on said recess and produces a phone attachment signal; and

switching circuitry for selectively establishing a connection between the internal circuitry of the computer and the internal circuitry of said mobile communication unit through said connector ports. It appears that the Examiner confuses this switching step with switching between high and low data rates of the two data lines of the USB port which is disclosed in Col. 7, lines 51- Col. 8, line 8 of Bork. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Bork does not anticipate amended Claim 9 of the instant application.

With respect to Claims 10, 11, 20, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection because Applicant submits that Bork does not disclose the claimed interface card.

The Examiner asserts that Bork discloses "wherein said control circuitry is provided in an interface card where the control circuitry of the interface card is located within a slot of said computer".

The interface card as shown in Figure 2, and described in the specification, comprises of a phone controller 24, a battery charger and a voltage sensor. Claim 11 has been amended to reflect the above-noted structure of the interface card. Claims 13-14 have also been amended to more clearly specify the structure of the interface card. Dependent Claims 13-14 have been amended to depend from Claim 11 as opposed to Claim 9. The voltage sensor of the interface cards detect whether the voltage of the rechargeable battery is higher than a specified level, and the sensor will activate the battery charger for charging the rechargeable battery when necessary through one of the plurality of connector ports. The interface card is connected between the USB interface and the connector. In operation the phone controller, located within the interface card, receives an on-off control signal from the computer controller for controlling the power switch of the mobile unit and supplies a serial command received from the mobile

unit. The on-off control signal controls the power switch 36 wherein the internal circuits of the mobile unit are energized by the battery.

While Bork does disclose an interface card, the reference does not teach its internal structure or function as claimed in the present application. See Figure 18.

In addition, in Claim 20, Bork does not disclose that the interface card contains switching circuitry for selectively establishing a connection between the internal circuitry of the computer and the internal circuitry of the mobile communication unit through connector ports.

In operation, switches 30 and 49 are provided to selectively establish paths or connections between the internal circuitry of the computer and mobile unit. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Bork does not anticipate Claim 10, amended Claim 11 and Claim 20 of the instant application, as the reference does not teach each and every limitation of the claims.

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's rejections of Claims 2-3, 7, 12, 18, 21-23 for the same reasons as set forth above regarding amended Claims 1 and 9.

Claims 4 and 15 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bork in view of Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,532) (hereinafter "Kim") and Freadman (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,532). Claims 5 and 16, and Claims 6 and 17 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bork in view of Kikinis W/O 96/365152 and Bork and Grimm et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,907,815) (hereinafter "Grimm"), respectively.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejections based upon the above-identified arguments. The additional cited references do not teach any of the limitations missing from the primary reference Bork and therefore Applicant submits that all of the dependant claims are patentably distinct from the combined prior art references.


Applicant submits a new independent Claim 24 herewith. New Claim 24 is directed to a method of connecting a mobile communication unit to a computer wherein the mobile communication unit comprises a voice recognition circuit and memory for storing a plurality of stored phone numbers. The claim also recites a method having the steps of reading a phone number from the memory corresponding to an output signal of the voice recognition circuit, and displaying the phone number on a screen of the computer and using the phone number for initiating a call to a communication network from the mobile communication unit. There is nothing in Bork or Kim that suggests combining a voice recognition circuit and a phone-number memory with a computer and displaying a phone number on a computer screen that corresponds with the phone number entered into the voice recognition circuit as claimed in Claim 24.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of independent Claims 1, 9 and 20 and dependant Claims 2-3, 7, and 9-14, 18 and 21-23 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Furthermore, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw rejections of dependent Claims 4-6, 8, 15-17, 19 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In conclusion, the Applicant believes that all of the claims in the above-identified application are in condition for allowance and henceforth respectfully solicits the allowance of the application. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite the allowance

of this application, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call the undersigned,
Applicant's attorney, at the following telephone number: (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,


Paul J. Esatto, Jr.
Registration No. 30,749

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

SW:lf